

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **18 November 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, and 21-24. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Traversat et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0184357, hereinafter “Traversat”), and Copeland et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0073630, hereinafter “Copeland”).

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Traversat in view of Copeland. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Embodiments of the present invention invalidate a resource record after issuing a predetermined number of queries for the resource record. Thus, embodiments of the present invention retrieve a resource record from a local cache, and send queries for the resource. Upon not receiving a response to the queries within a predetermined amount of time **and after issuing a predetermined number of queries for the resource record**, embodiments of the present invention invalidate the resource record (see instant application, paragraphs [0029]-[0030]). This is beneficial because it ensures that the local cache maintains valid resource records, while making allowances for either the query or a response to the query getting lost in the network due to unforeseen network failures.

There is nothing in Traversat or Copeland, either singly or in concert, that Traversat that discloses sending a **predetermined number of queries and** waiting a predetermined amount of time for a response before invalidating the resource record if a response is not received.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17, have been amended to clarify that invalidating a resource record occurs at a cache after waiting a predetermined

amount of time for a response as well as after issuing a predetermined number of queries for the resource record. New claims 35-37 have been added that reiterate original claims 4, 12, and 20. No new matter has been added.

**Note that new claims 38-39 that are directed towards the process of invalidating a resource record at a local cache in a client computer system have been added.** These claims find support in paragraphs [0027]-[0030] of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 38, as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that the dependent claims which depend upon the independent claims are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

### CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.  
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony Jones /  
Anthony Jones  
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 20 January 2009

Anthony Jones  
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1666  
Fax: (530) 759-1665  
Email: tony@parklegal.com